

The Œcumenical Patriarchate Under the Turkish Republic: The First Ten Years

Harry J. Psomiades*



The theme of this paper is the struggle of the Œcumenical Patriarchate for survival in Kemalist Turkey and the role of the Œcumenical Patriarchate in Graeco-Turkish diplomacy. The first ten years of the Patriarchate under the Turkish Republic were difficult ones for Orthodoxy, and seriously threatened to disrupt the prospects of peace in the Balkans and the Near East. The need for adjustment and compromise forced upon the Œcumenical Patriarchate by the triumph of nationalism in the Balkans and the Near East, and by the tragic expulsion of Hellenism from Anatolia, marks the beginning of a major turning point in the history of the Church of Constantinople.

*Mr. Psomiades is a lecturer in Government, Columbia University. The research in which this article is based was made possible by funds granted by the Ford Foundation. The Foundation, however, is not to be understood as approving by virtue of its grant any of the statements or views expressed therein.

THE LAUSANNE SETTLEMENT

On December 16, 1922, the Turkish delegation presented to the sub-commission on the exchange of populations a written declaration supporting its previous requests for the removal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Turkey on the grounds that a radical modification had taken place in the organization of the new Turkish state. The declaration maintained that 'the Government of the Grand National Assembly intended to grant to minorities resident in Turkey rights identical with those which had been granted to minorities in the States enlarged or newly constituted as a result of the great war.' It added that the Turkish Government,

‘ . . . by separating the Caliphate and the State, and by establishing a democratic régime, had suppressed the privileges which had been granted in the Ottoman Empire to the non-Muslim communities. The relation between the charitable, educational and philanthropic institutions of the minorities and the State must henceforth be carried on direct; the clergy and its hierarchal chief must not in the future concern itself with any but spiritual matters. The Patriarchate, which had always been a political organ, must be transferred to some place outside the frontier of Turkey, seeing that as a result of the abolition of the political privileges which it had formerly enjoyed and of the organic institutions which depended on it, it had lost all reason to exist.’¹

On January 4, 1923, the Turkish delegation formally demanded that the Ecumenical Patriarchate be removed from Turkey. It drew attention to the very hostile attitude adopted by the Patriarchate towards Turkey in the course of the last war, and reasoned that the abolition of the temporal power of the Caliph called for the removal of the Patriarchate from Constantinople. It threatened to remove all the Greeks from Constantinople and to withdraw its acceptance in principle of the solution proposed for all the other questions submitted to the sub-commission, if the question of the Patriarchate were not solved to its satisfaction. It suggested that the Patriarchate could transfer its seat to Mount Athos and exercise thence its spiritual influence over the Orthodox world.²

In return for the expulsion of the Patriarchate from Turkey, it appeared that the Turkish Government was prepared to make certain concessions to the Greeks. In effect, its delegation gave the President of the sub-commission on the exchange of populations, G. G. Montagna, to understand that if the Greeks accepted the Turkish demand, it was prepared to extend the scope of some of the clauses for the retention of a greater number of Greeks in Constantinople.³

The Turkish request, however, was unanimously opposed in the sub-commission. The French delegation, in an attempt to facilitate an accord, proposed a compromise formula whereby the Ecumenical Patriarchate would remain in Constantinople on condition that it give up all its political power. The Greek delegation, from the beginning, accepted and supported the idea that the Patriarchate should be divested of the political power bestowed upon it by the defunct

Ottoman state. The Turkish delegation rejected the proposal, and the matter was referred to the First Commission of the Conference.⁴

The Territorial and Military Commission met on January 10, 1923, to hear the report of Montagna. Lord Curzon, President of the Commission, took the initiative in formulating a final solution of the problem. With the unanimous support of the inviting powers and of the Orthodox Christian states, he met the Turkish demand with equal firmness. "There seems to me to be no reason why the Patriarch should not continue to exercise his spiritual and ecclesiastical prerogatives without enjoying any sort of political and administrative authority at all. On the other hand, if these spiritual and ecclesiastical prerogatives were to be destroyed and the seat of the Patriarchate removed from Constantinople, a shock would be delivered to the conscience of the whole civilized world.'⁵ Venizelos urged the Turks to accept Lord Curzon's proposals and stated that if they were accepted, the Greek delegation would 'take steps with a view to the retirement of the Patriarch now in power.'⁶

In the face of this opposition and the proposal of Venizelos, Ismet Pasha, the chief Turkish delegate, gave a reluctant verbal promise that his Government would retain the Œcumenical Patriarchate, provided that it would confine itself within the limits of purely religious matters. The Turkish delegation, he said, 'taking note of the solemn declarations and assurances which have just been given concerning the future situation and attitude of the Patriarchate, and in order to give a supreme proof of its conciliatory dispositions, renounces the expulsion of the Patriarchate from Constantinople.'⁷ Thus, the problem of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, which had not only considerably retarded the work of the Conference, but also threatened, for a while, to provoke a complete rupture of the negotiations, was resolved.



Borders of Turkey set by the Treaty of Lausanne (Signed July 24, 1923).

Why was it that the Turkish Government was so adamant on this issue? It appears that from the beginning it sought the expulsion of the Patriarchate as a concession for the retention of the Greek minority in Constantinople. Originally, it demanded that both the Patriarchate and the Greek minority leave Turkey so as to bring to an end Greek aspirations for the imperial capital of Byzantium. Such a course, it felt, would constitute for Greece a definite abandonment of the Μεγάλη Ιδέα. Secondly, the anti-Turkish activity of Meletios iv, who had been Œcumenical Patriarch since December, 1921, was extremely distasteful to the Turkish Government; and it was only after the promise of Venizelos that Meletios iv would be replaced, that Ismet Pasha finally agreed to allow the Patriarchate to remain. Thirdly, it seemed that the Ankara Government may have felt that by expelling the Patriarchate, the most important religious institution in the Ottoman Empire after the Caliphate, the success of its plan to abolish the Caliphate and to expel all the members of the Ottoman imperial family from Turkey would be enhanced. It wanted to prove to its Muslim population that the expulsion of all religious authorities was a general measure and not anti-Muslim, that it was a consequence of the adoption of the fundamental principles of Western democracy.⁸ Fourthly, its actions were undoubtedly colored by the *Millet* mentality. That the Patriarchate and the Greek Christian minority of Turkey are generally considered as untrustworthy aliens in the Turkish body-politic is a result, in part, of the confusion in the Turkish Muslim mind between what is essentially national with what is essentially religious. For all practical purposes religion is still the dividing line in Turkish society, and a man's creed is the determinant of his political and social status.⁹ And finally, the Turks had recently fought the Greeks in a bitter military campaign upon which their existence as a nation depended. Turkish public opinion demanded that Greece pay dearly for its Anatolian venture.

Although in the final Treaty and the Conventions annexed, there were no clauses providing for the rights and privileges of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, İsmet Pasha's declarations regarding the irremovability of the Patriarchate are clearly in the nature of an international engagement.¹⁰ While the Treaty of Lausanne assured the Œcumenical Patriarchate a seat in Constantinople, it did not, in effect, prevent the Turkish Government from interfering with the liberty of the Patriarch and the free exercise of his œcumenical function. In fact, the future of the Patriarchate was to depend, as it had since Greek Independence, upon the temper of Graeco-Turkish relations.

PAPA EFTHIM AND THE TURKISH ORTHODOX CHURCH

The anti-Turkish statements and activities of the reigning Patriarch, Meletios IV, considerably weakened the status of the Œcumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople.¹¹ While the Turkish Government was moving for the dismissal of the Patriarchate from Turkey at Lausanne, it was also seeking to undermine the Patriarchate by supporting, for a while, factions within the church and Papa Efthim Karahissaridis' Turkish Orthodox Church project.¹²

Papa Efthim, with the apparent support and approval of the Turkish Government, attempted to organize a Turkish Orthodox Church antagonistic to and independent of the Œcumenical Patriarchate. In the Autumn of 1922, Prokopios, Metropolitan of Iconium (Konya) and the highest ranking prelate left in Anatolia, formed a 'Synod' with two subordinate titular bishops and took other action at variance with Orthodox Christian canon law. They coöpted two other priests, one of whom was Papa Efthim, and this body of five prelates claimed to be the governing body of the Turkish Orthodox Church.' Papa Efthim was chosen as the 'General Representative' of the Turkish Church.¹³



Meletios IV declared, at that time that the Phanar was considering the difficulty, but was unwilling to take immediate disciplinary action as it feared that the peccant prelates may have been coerced into schismatical behavior by the Ankara Government. He explained that the Phanar was willing to meet the Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians halfway by being prepared to set up, in a canonical manner, a special ecclesiastical province, autonomous but subject to the Œcumenical Patriarchate, in which the liturgical language would be Turkish.¹⁴ Papa Efthim answered that only by severing themselves completely from the Phanar, which was subject to a foreign power and on very bad terms with the Ankara Government, would the Turkish Orthodox Christians find peace in Anatolia. He bitterly complained that the Œcumenical Patriarchate and Meletios IV in particular had plotted to undermine the Turkish Orthodox Church movement by removing him from Turkey and by making false promises.¹⁵

At the time, there were about 50,000 Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians left in Anatolia, who were either descendants of Turks that had embraced Christianity under the Byzantines, or Greeks that had adopted Turkish as a mother tongue in the Seljukid or Ottoman period. It appeared for a while that these Turkish-speaking Christians were to be exempted from the compulsory population-exchange agreement between Turkey and Greece. On December 12, 1922, Lord Curzon declared, at Lausanne, that the exchange of populations would result in the almost complete disappearance of the Greek population from Anatolia, 'though there will, I suppose, remain the reconciled Ottoman Greeks numbered at about 50,000 persons.'¹⁶ On the following day, İsmet Pasha explained that the Orthodox Turks had never asked for treatments differing in any respect from that enjoyed by their Muslim compatriots, and it is most improbable . that they would ever make such a request.'¹⁷ Apparently, Venizelos also agreed with Lord Curzon and İsmet Pasha that '50,000 Turkish-speaking persons of the Orthodox faith would stay [in Anatolia] in any case.'¹⁸

Notwithstanding the declarations at Lausanne and the growing belief in Ankara that the Turkish-speaking Christians and many of the Greek-speaking Christians were formerly Turks, all the Greeks and Turkish-speaking Christians of the Orthodox faith in Anatolia were shipped to Greece under the compulsory population-exchange agreement concluded at Lausanne, thus depriving the Turkish Orthodox Church movement of popular support. In Greece, the Turkish-speaking Christians were easily assimilated into the population, as they considered themselves Greeks by race and religion.



Papa Eftim I: "Turkish Orthodox Patriarch and Archbishop of Istanbul"

THE ABDICATION OF MELETIOS IV

During the Spring of 1923, Papa Efthim, with the aid of the Turkish authorities, seized the church of Panagia Kaphatiani in Galata, Istanbul, and directed a systematic and violent campaign against the Patriarchate.¹⁹ On June 1, 1923, in an obvious attempt to show their allegiance to the Turkish Government and to win its support, supporters of Papa Efthim, led by Damianos Damianides of Galata, attacked the Phanar and injured the Patriarch. The Turkish police, although present throughout the demonstrations, did not interfere, and the French military police (the Allies were still on occupation duty in the City) were called to restore order.²⁰ A few days later Papa Efthim announced to the Turkish press and Government that there was an enemy and adversary of the Turkish people in the Phanar and called for the immediate resignation of Meletios IV. He commended D. Damianides and his followers for assaulting the Patriarchate.²¹

Sensing his precarious position in Turkey, but most reluctant to vacate the Œcumenical Throne, Meletios IV seriously advocated the removal of the Patriarchate to Thessalonica or to Mount Athos. In October 1922, he remarked to Italian newspapermen that it might be necessary to transfer the Patriarchate to Mount Athos if it could not exercise its functions freely in Turkey. In the same month, the Holy Synod met twice to discuss the transfer of the Patriarchate to a place outside of Turkey.²² After the attacks against the Patriarchate in June, 1923, Meletios IV renewed his bid to relocate the Patriarchate. He reasoned with Mr. Alexander A. Pallis, the Director of the Greek Red Cross in Turkey, that although the Patriarchate was allowed to remain in Kemalist Turkey, the limitations imposed upon it by the Turkish authorities would weaken its prestige and authority in the Orthodox world. As a result of the exchange of population only a few Greeks would be allowed to remain in Turkey, and such a situation would render it very difficult to find intelligent and able clerics with the necessary Turkish citizenship to assume the vacancies in the Holy Synod and the church administration. The future of the Patriarchate, he pleaded, could only be assured by removing it outside the boundaries of Turkey. Pallis, voicing the opinion of the Greek Government, replied that as long as Greeks were settled in Constantinople the Œcumenical Patriarchate should remain in that city.²³

Meletios IV again presented the issue of the removal of the Patriarchate to the Holy Synod and dispatched a telegram to his friend Venizelos at Lausanne, requesting his advice on this matter. Pallis was with Meletios IV when the latter received the counsel of Venizelos to abdicate. According to Pallis, Meletios IV was much incensed at this recommendation, but decided to follow it because it was supported by the Greek Government. Notwithstanding several changes of mind, he finally withdrew from Constantinople on July 10, 1923, to a monastery on Mount Athos.²⁴

The aspirations of Meletios IV and the objectives of Greek foreign policy were clearly at odds. In January 1923, Venizelos had assured İsmet Pasha at Lausanne that Meletios IV would

abdicate, and to the Greek press he announced that the maintenance of the Patriarchate at Constantinople was an important Hellenic interest and that Meletios iv would resign immediately following the conclusion of peace. 'He [Meletios] agrees on this point.' Although he was a personal friend of Meletios IV, Venizelos felt that his removal would improve the situation of the Patriarchate and that of the Greek minority in Turkey.²⁵ On the other hand, Meletios iv was very reluctant to abdicate, at least not until normal relations between the Orthodox Church and the Turkish Government were reestablished and the future of those relations properly secured; he refused to believe that normal relations could be obtained only by his abdication. Although he withdrew from Turkey, he did not abdicate; instead, he appointed Nicholas, Metropolitan of Caesaria, as locum tenens and continued his campaign to win support for the transference of the Œcumenical Patriarchate to Greece.²⁶ Meletios was a very active person whose good judgment was often marred by his ambition. Notwithstanding this trait, he did much to improve the position of the Œcumenical Patriarchate in its relations with the other Orthodox Churches, and his concern for his Church was real. The future of the Patriarchate was left in complete uncertainty, and for a while it appeared that the Patriarchate would either be treated as extinct, or reconstituted in such a fashion that its composition and direction would be identical with Papa Efthim's Turkish Orthodox Church.

When Meletios IV withdrew from Turkey, Papa Efthim intensified his efforts in Ankara to gain support for his church program and, although married and the father of four children, to have himself nominated Œcumenical Patriarch. Upon his return to Constantinople in the Autumn of 1923, the Turkish press gave his proposed project full and sympathetic coverage; his plans seemed to be close to realization.²⁷

On October 2, 1923, an hour before the Allied evacuation of Constantinople was completed, Papa Efthim, accompanied by an adequate body of Turkish police and some of his partisans, forced his way into the room where the Holy Synod was in session and presented an ultimatum to the attending bishops ordering them within ten minutes to declare Meletios iv deposed. In spite of the vigorous protest of two of the eight members of the Holy Synod, the required declaration was voted for, and six of the eight members of the Holy Synod, whose Sees were situated outside the boundaries of Turkey, along with the Patriarch's locum tenens, were virtually expelled from the Phanar. Papa Efthim then announced that he intended to remain at the Patriarchate until seven new members, nominated by him, were admitted to the Holy Synod and a new Œcumenical Patriarch, agreeable to Ankara, was elected. His demands, save for the election of a new Patriarch, were conceded, and he returned to Ankara as the 'official representative' of the Phanar.²⁸

The bold and theatrical actions of Papa Efthim resulted in adverse criticism and a reversal of public opinion. His violence and arrogance were publicly reprimanded and officially disavowed. Hüseyin Cahid, the editor of Tanin, declared that his first impulse was to laugh at Papa Efthim's

vaudevillesque actions, but argued that they were really serious, and that while it was admittedly impossible for Meletios iv to remain Œcumenical Patriarch and that a change was necessary, it would have been possible to arrange the affair in accordance with the interests as well as the honor of the State. If, he continued, Papa Efthim acted on his own responsibility, he should be punished for the outrage, whereas if he acted with the knowledge of the authorities, then such conduct was unworthy of a properly constituted government. The Turkish Press Bureau, on October 12th, reported that the Ankara Government received with astonishment the nomination of Papa Efthim as Official representative of the Phanar at Ankara, and denied that the Patriarchate, a purely religious organization, had the right to send such a representative to them.²⁹

The change in attitude of the Turkish Government was also influenced by internal difficulties, by Christian public opinion abroad, and by the correct behavior of the Greek Government. Although Papa Efthim's actions caused considerable indignation and animosity in Greece and the Orthodox world, the Greek Government, on October 12th, reported to the press that it was desirous of reestablishing friendly relations with Turkey and was prepared to recognize a new Œcumenical Patriarch at Constantinople, provided that his election was carried out strictly in accordance with the ecclesiastical rules and regulations. On the same day, Chrysostom, the Metropolitan of Athens, was sent to Thessalonica to obtain the abdication of Meletios iv. The Greek Government and Venizelos were opposed to the plans of Meletios iv, who appeared determined to remove (temporarily) the Patriarchate to Thessalonica, for fear that once removed the Turks would never permit the restoration of the Patriarchate in Turkey. They told Meletios iv that the creation of another Patriarchate at Thessalonica would be against the best interests of the Orthodox Church. ⁸⁰

Meletios IV finally gave in to the reasoning of the Greek Government, and the document of abdication was actually signed when news was received of Papa Efthim's incursions. The official document containing the formal and canonical abdication of the Œcumenical Patriarch was dated September 20, 1923, and was to be read at the meeting of the Holy Synod scheduled for November 10, 1923. But the activities of Papa Efthim prompted Meletios iv to postpone the announcement of his abdication.⁸¹ However, under pressure from all sides, he abdicated, and the Holy Synod received friendly instructions from the Turkish Government to make ready for a new election with the understanding that the new Patriarch would be a Turkish subject, sympathetic to Turkey, and elected by Turkish subjects.⁸²



Meletius IV [Metaxakis], Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople from 8 December 1921 – 20 September 1923

GREGORIOS VII

On December 6, 1923, Gregorios, Metropolitan of Chalcedon, was elected Ecumenical Patriarch by a vote of ten to one, and, after vehement opposition from Papa Efthim, was enthroned as Gregorios vu on December 13. On the day following the election and prior to the enthronement, Papa Efthim, who was not allowed to attend the election, and his protégé, Kyrillos, Metropolitan of Rhodopolis, again descended upon the Phanar, drove out all its occupants, and declared that in his position as 'general procurator' he had taken over the Holy Synod and would continue to occupy the Phanar until a new election for a legitimate Patriarch took place. In an open letter to Gregorios, he wrote, 'You know that you do not have the confidence of the [Turkish] Government. By accepting the office of Patriarch you have harmed the interests of the community. I advise you to resign.' 33

However, two days later the Turkish police, with orders from Ankara, expelled Papa Efthim and his followers from the Phanar and restored it to its legal occupants. The Turkish Minister of Justice explained in the Grand National Assembly that the Patriarchate was solely a religious institution and that the election of Gregorios vu had the approval of the Turkish Government. f So far as the Government is concerned, the Patriarch is the head of the priests, and the Government has the right to watch over his election, in which the candidates and voters must be Turkish subjects. The Government does not know of any foreign intervention nor believes it possible; if it had discovered such intervention the election would have been annulled.' On December 25, Kemal Pasha sent Gregorios vu a telegram thanking him for his favorable expressions toward the Republic.⁸⁴

The second crisis in the reign of Gregorios vu resulted from the dissolution of the Caliphate in Turkey, March 1924. *Akşam* and the other Turkish newspapers proposed that as a natural complement to the abolition of the Caliphate, the Ecumenical Patriarchate should be removed from Turkey. *Tanin*, however, urged its readers not to confuse the issue of the Caliphate with that of the (Ecumenical Patriarchate. It was impossible, it stated, to suppress the Patriarchate because of commitments made at Lausanne.³⁵ Although Kemal Pasha was reported to have said, 'Now that the Caliphate has been suppressed, it should be necessary also to suppress the Patriarchate,' the Turkish Government remained loyal to its pledges given at Lausanne.³⁶ In spite of the constant charges that Gregorios VII was working for the interests of Greece and that he was an agent of the Greek foreign office, and notwithstanding the incursions of Papa Efthim and the reaction resulting from the dissolution of the Caliphate, the eleven-month reign of the Patriarch was a comparatively peaceful one, and he achieved what relatively few Patriarchs before him were able to achieve—a quiet death in office (November 16, 1924). 37



Gregory VII [Zervoudakis] of Constantinople, Ecumenical Patriarch from 6 December 1923-17 November 1924.

CONSTANTINE VI

The comparative calm was broken by the stormy events following the election of Constantine Araboglu on December 17, 1924, as the new Patriarch. His election generated such a bitter quarrel between Turkey and Greece that war appeared imminent. Prior to his election, the Turkish press gave due warning that Constantine Araboglu was not eligible for the Patriarchal Throne because he was not a native of Constantinople as defined in Article 2 of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations signed at Lausanne, January 30, 1923. On the day before his election, the Turkish police reiterated the warning, and the exchangeability of the cleric was referred for a ruling to the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Populations after the Constantinople sub-commission declined to give a decision on this delicate matter.³⁸

Meanwhile, the Turkish Legation in Athens, anticipating the reaction of Greece to these proceedings, issued a *communiqué* on December 30, 1924, assuring Greece that Turkey would respect the Patriarchate, but maintaining that the new Patriarch, Constantine VI, by virtue of being born outside the city of Constantinople, albeit in Turkey, was an exchangeable Greek as denned in Articles 1 and 2 of the exchange Convention. The *communiqué* announced that the Turkish Government deplored the exaggerated impressions given by the Greek press that the Œcumenical Patriarchate was in danger, and was waiting for the decision of the Mixed Commission before taking action against the Patriarch.³⁹

On January 28, 1925, the Mixed Commission, with the abstention of its Greek members, made the following declaration:⁴⁰

‘ . . . while noting the facts contained in the report of the Sixth Sub-Committee, No. 2360, dated December 17, 1924, in regard to the possibility of exchanging Mgr. Constantine Araboglou, former Metropolitan of Dercos, according to which Mgr. Constantine Araboglou, having been born in Asia Minor and having gone to Constantinople after October 30, 1918, fulfilling in his person all the conditions necessary for the purpose of exchange, holds that it is beyond its competence to take a decision in regard to the case of this ecclesiastic in view of the fact that he is a Metropolitan.’

The verdict of the Mixed Commission was evasive. It would neither give, nor refuse to give, an exit passport to Constantine Araboglu, and at no time referred to him as Œcumenical Patriarch.⁴¹

(a) *The Expulsion of Constantine VI*

Greek public opinion was outraged when on January 30, 1925, the Turkish police abruptly removed Constantine VI from Turkish territory.⁴² In the Greek Parliament, the Prime Minister,

Mr. A. Michalakopoulos, declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch would greatly obstruct the Government's desire to reestablish normal relations with Turkey. Most members of Parliament felt that the act was a grave insult to the Greek people and the civilized world.⁴³ On February 1, the Greek protest against the expulsion of the Patriarch was conveyed to the Turkish Government along with a notice that Greece intended to appeal her case to the League of Nations, as the Turkish action was a clear violation of the Treaty of Lausanne and threatened the peace. The Greek member of the Mixed Commission, G. A. Exindaris, tendered his resignation, characterizing the Turkish Government's treatment of the Patriarch as worse than that accorded the *hamals* (porters) of Constantinople; the Patriarch was expelled without time to pack his personal belongings. He warned Turkey that her action would hurt her, as it would arouse the anger not only of the Greeks, but of all Christendom. He claimed that since the Mixed Commission did not issue Constantine VI a passport nor ask him to leave the country, the Turks had no legal right to expel him. He argued that the exchange of population was not an internal affair, as the Turks seemed to think, but an international matter in which only the Mixed Commission had the authority to decide who was to be exchanged.⁴⁴

The Turkish press responded with naïve surprise at the indignation of the Greeks over the removal of Constantine VI from Turkey. It enthusiastically supported the expulsion and declared that the Turkish Government would regard any foreign *demarche* on behalf of the Phanar as an intrusion in the internal affairs of the country. Several newspapers, including Yunus Nadi's *Cumhuriyet*, advocated the exchange of all the Greeks of Constantinople for the Turks of Western Thrace, 'as it would *ipso facto* abolish the *raison d'être* of the Phanar.' *Vatan* reported that Papa Efthim would establish a new Patriarchate, and most of the newspapers declared that Turkey would not be intimidated by Greece. 'Even though Greece is prepared for war, she is too busy in the Balkans to be a threat to Turkey.' *İstiklâl* stated that as the Caliphate was abolished so must Turkey expel the Patriarchate; 'we cannot allow the Greeks to have a foreign organ in our country.'⁴⁵ *Tanin*, however, cautioned the Government not to impose its view on the question of the Patriarchate and criticized Ankara for reawakening an anti-European fanaticism among the people at a time when conciliation with Europe was necessary. The Mosul question and internal problems, it insisted, were far more important than any advantage resulting from the expulsion of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.⁴⁶

On February 2, the Turkish Legation in Athens announced that the Patriarch was found exchangeable because he was born in Anatolia and came to Constantinople after October 30, 1918. Turkey does not wish to destroy the Patriarchate; the Greeks must merely elect a non-exchangeable person to that institution according to Turkish law. Turkey, it continued, desires peace and friendship with Greece, but cannot tolerate meddling in her internal affairs. ⁴⁷

On February 4, the Turkish Prime Minister, Fethi Bey, delivered a speech in the Turkish Grand National Assembly in response to the Greek note on the expulsion of the Patriarch. He

warned Greece that Turkey refused to be intimidated and that the Greek note was considered unfriendly by the Turkish Government, as the Patriarchate was a purely domestic institution. He accused the Greeks of efforts to incite Christendom against them and of entertaining hostile intentions against Turkey. He argued:

'As you know from the debates at Lausanne, the Turkish delegation asked that the Patriarch be removed from Constantinople and even wanted to exchange the Greeks of Constantinople. After the Great Powers and Greece assured us that the Patriarchate would not meddle in politics, the leader of our delegation, Ismet Pasha, announced his consent to retain the Patriarchate in Turkey. These declarations were inserted in the verbatim proceedings—one does not find them in any article of the Treaty. It could not be otherwise since Turkey would not accept a document or an international engagement relative to a question of a purely domestic nature.'⁴⁸

On the same day, Cevat Bey, the Turkish Ambassador to Paris, reported to the press that Greece should keep out of Turkish affairs and that Turkey would not accept any decision of the League of Nations or the Hague Court on this matter. If there is a threat to the peace, as the Greeks claim, it is they who have instigated this threat.^{48a} Tevfik Rüştü Bey (Aras), in Rome, declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch was in order, and that the only thing left to be done was to elect a new Patriarch who was not exchangeable.⁴⁹

The Turks felt that the Holy Synod, knowing the position of Constantine vi and being, in addition, notified of his ineligible status, had deliberately elected him Patriarch to hinder the normal resumption of Turco-Greek relations. They considered it a political move contrary to the decisions which had effected the retention of the Patriarchate in Turkey. Their case was simply that the expulsion of Constantine vi was merely putting into effect the decision of the Mixed Commission, which found the person of Constantine Araboglu exchangeable under the terms of the exchange Convention. Fethi Bey made it clear that the expulsion of Constantine Araboglu did not mean that the Turkish Government would not honor its pledge given at Lausanne to retain the Œcumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople. However, he insisted that the voting members of the Holy Synod and the elected Patriarch had to be Turkish subjects as defined by Article 3 of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations. The Greek view for the retention of Metropolitans in Turkey on the basis of 'position' was unacceptable.⁵⁰

The Greeks insisted that Constantine vi was not exchangeable because his 'establishment at Constantinople dated from the year 1902, the date when he was appointed a Metropolitan and thus gaining permanent residence in that city,' all Metropolitans being members of the monastery of the Phanar at Constantinople. They also claimed that the Patriarch was protected from deportation by Ismet Pasha's promise that the Patriarchate would be allowed to remain in Turkey as a purely religious institution, since the Patriarch was the most essential component of the

Patriarchate.⁵¹ The Turkish action, they argued, was contrary to the exchange Convention, which stipulated that only the Mixed Commission had the right to issue passports to decide who was to be exchanged. The real issue for them was that on basis of the Turkish approach all but three of the Metropolitans who composed the Holy Synod of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, having arrived at Constantinople after October 1918, were exchangeable subjects. If Turkey had her way over the expulsion of Constantine vi, what would prevent her from deporting the remaining 'exchangeable' prelates? Such an admission would be tantamount to the abolition of the Ecumenical Patriarchate in Turkey, as canon law required that the Patriarch be elected by a Holy Synod of twelve Metropolitans.⁵²



Constantine VI of Constantinople, Ecumenical Patriarch from 17 December 1924 – 22 May 1925.

(b) The Greek Appeal to the League

On February 11, 1925, the Greek Prime Minister, Mr. A. Michalakopoulos, requested under the provisions of paragraph 2, article 11, of the League Covenant that the world organization consider the question of the Œcumenical Patriarchate. He declared that the expulsion of the Patriarch was a hostile act which threatened the peace, and telegraphed to the League the following message:⁵³

'The Greek Government states that the measure taken against the Patriarch by the Turkish authorities constitutes a serious infringement of the Lausanne agreements regarding the Patriarchate, an infringement of Article 12 of the Convention for the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, and of the Mixed Commission's decision of January 28, 1925, and, further, that it is contrary to the understanding given on October 31, 1924, at Brussels by Turkey loyally to carry out all decisions that might be adopted by the majority of the Mixed Commission for the .Exchange of Populations.'

In response, the Turkish Government sent the following telegram, dated March 1, to the League in support of its position:⁵⁴

'The Patriarchate is a Turkish domestic institution, the constitution and administration of which are governed by Turkish laws and regulations, and there are no provisions whatsoever in any Treaty in which a contrary view could be based; there is, moreover, no clause giving one or several foreign powers the right to intervene in the constitution and the administration of this institution; furthermore, notwithstanding the assertions contained in the Greek Government's telegram neither the Treaty of Lausanne nor the agreements, conventions, declarations, protocols and letters signed at that place contain the slightest allusion to the Patriarchate. . . . It is obvious that the Greek Government wishes to take advantage of this opportunity to endeavor to make the Patriarchate into an international institution and so interfere in Turkish domestic affair, whereas, as we have already stated, no international treaty or convention contains any provisions regarding that institution. . . .'

The Turks refused to send a representative before the League to plead their case; Turkey was not a member of the League, and denied that the League had jurisdiction in this matter.

At the Council meeting of March 14, 1925, the Greek representative, Mr. D. Kakjamanos, assured the League that Greece did not want to interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey, but that 'the maintenance of the Patriarchate of Constantinople had been one of the provisions of international agreements.'⁵⁵ On the same day, the Council adopted the following resolution for a decision by the Permanent Court of International Justice at the Hague:

'Do the objections of the competence of the Council raised by the Turkish Government in its letter of March 1 which is communicated to the Court, preclude the Council from being competent in the matter brought before it by the Greek Government by its telegram to the SecretaryGeneral of the League of Nations dated February 11, 1925.'

It also adopted a resolution directing Greece and Turkey to settle the dispute privately, and suggested that they might use the good offices of the neutral members of the Mixed Commission.⁵⁶

The earlier negotiations between Mr. G. A. Exindaris and Tevfik Rüştü Bey for the settlement of the Patriarchal problem were deadlocked. Turkey wanted Greece to withdraw her application for the settlement of the question from the League, and the open direct negotiations between the two Governments for a satisfactory solution of the problem. On February 23, 1925, the *Vali* (Governor) of Constantinople, Süleyman Sami Bey, took a conciliatory step by informing the Holy Synod, which was then in session, that he would try to arrange a non-exchangeable status for its members and for which, in return, he expected the Holy Synod to obtain the abdication of Constantine vi and to proceed with the election of a non-exchangeable Patriarch.⁵⁷

The Greeks seemed to feel that the Turkish promises were too vague and refused to withdraw their application from the League.⁵⁸ By bringing the case to the League, they hoped, once and for all, to establish the international character of the Œcumenical Patriarchate so as to prevent the complete subjection of that institution to the whim of the Turkish Government, and to avoid, in future, conflicts with Turkey arising out of the unsettled status of the Patriarchate.

(c) The Success of Direct Negotiations

For several weeks following the expulsion of the Patriarch, the press of both countries denounced and berated each other, and rumors of Turkish and Greek troop movements along their common Thracian border were rife. But towards the end of March, the readiness of the Turkish Government to come to an understanding with the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and the sudden improvement of Graeco-Turkish relations in general, eased the tense situation. The refugee-settlement problem, constitutional issues, and the political isolation of Greece, and in Turkey the elimination of political opposition, the Kurdish revolts, the problem of internal reform, and the general feeling that the Western world and the League were hostile to Turkish interests, especially in the regions of Mosul and Alexandretta (İskenderum), were factors which contributed to the resumption of negotiations between the two states.

Tanin declared on February 12 that it was afraid the Government would impose its point of view on the question of the Patriarchate and that in attempting to preserve its prestige it might give in on Mosul, thereby losing a lot more than it would gain by expelling the Patriarchate. This

is why, it explained, the British attitude towards the expulsion of the Patriarchate was very reserved and almost neutral.

By April, it was apparent that both Turkey and Greece wished to settle all the issues outstanding between them. The trip of John Politis, the newly appointed Greek representative, to Ankara was viewed favorably by the Turkish press, and the newspapers of both countries reported that agreements on the exchange-of-populations question, which had marred Graeco-Turkish relations since 1923, were soon to be concluded.⁵⁹ In this friendly atmosphere, and in exchange for a Turkish promise to extend nonexchangeable status to the members of the Holy Synod, excepting Constantine vi, the Greek Government resumed direct negotiations with Turkey for the settlement of the issue concerning the Œcumenical Patriarchate. It urged Constantine vi to abdicate and asked the fifty-eight Metropolitans whose dioceses belonged to the Œcumenical Patriarchate (although they had been located in Greece since 1912) to accept the abdication, as it would help to better relations with Turkey and to improve the lot of the Greek minority in Constantinople.⁶⁰ On May 19, Constantine vi informed the Greek Government that he was forwarding his abdication to the Holy Synod of Constantinople. The Greek press expressed the hope that his personal sacrifice would reopen the way for more cordial relations between the two countries and that agreements on the population-exchange question, which it felt would shortly be signed in Ankara, would lead to a Graeco-Turkish rapprochement.⁶¹

The abdication of the Patriarch was accepted on May 26, and three days later in Ankara, G. A. Exindaris reported that the Turkish Government had assured him that the election of the new Patriarch would be orderly and proper. The authorities in Constantinople were directed to prevent Papa Efthim or anyone else from making trouble at the Phanar.⁶² On June 8, the Greek Government informed the League, in a letter dated June 1, that the negotiations between Greece and Turkey on the subject of the Œcumenical Patriarchate had been successfully concluded.⁶³

‘ ... the Turkish representative of the Mixed Commission for the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations in a letter to the Greek member of the Mixed Commission has declared that he withdraws definitely the dossiers relating to the exchangeability of the members of the Holy Synod. The question having therefore been settled, and the Greek Patriarch having abdicated, the Holy Synod will proceed with the election of a new Patriarch. The Greek Government, therefore, withdraws its request of February 11, 1925, to the League Council, and begs it to inform the Permanent Court of International Justice of the solution of the question.’

On July 13, notwithstanding the renewed proposals of Papa Efthim and his followers that the Turkish Government should participate in the elections, the Holy Synod, in a quiet atmosphere, freely and canonically elected Basil Georgiades, Metropolitan of Nicaea, as the (Œcumenical Patriarch Basil III).⁶⁴



Basil III of Constantinople, Ecumenical Patriarch from 13 July 1925 – 29 September 1929.

THE ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SETTLEMENT OF 1930

After the final settlement of the population-exchange question and the beginning of political cooperation between Greece and Turkey in 1930, the Œcumenical Patriarchate ceased to be a major concern in Graeco-Turkish diplomacy. In May 1931, Kemal reassured Venizelos, the Greek Premier since 1928, that he would keep Papa Efthim out of the affairs of the Patriarchate.⁶⁶ Although Papa Efthim was important to the Turkish Nationalists, who emphasized the ties of blood between the Turkish peoples, psychologically the majority of the Muslim Turkish people were not prepared to accept non-Muslims as brothers. We must look elsewhere to explain the connection of Papa Efthim and the Turkish Government. It seems certain that he was merely another pawn in the hands of the Turkish diplomats at Lausanne and after. As soon as the outstanding issues between Greece and Turkey were resolved, the project for a Turkish Orthodox Church sank into oblivion and Papa Efthim was no longer posed as a threat to the Phanar.

The improved relations between Greece and Turkey, and the Œcumenical Patriarchate and Turkey, were illustrated by an incident which occurred during the visit of Venizelos to Turkey. In October, 1930, Venizelos was invited to Turkey to sign a treaty of friendship with the Ankara Government, and to discuss measures for establishing better relations between the two countries. He declined to go to Ankara via the railway center at Haydar Paşa, an Anatolian suburb of metropolitan Constantinople, explaining that if he visited Constantinople he would be obliged to visit the Œcumenical Patriarch, and that this might strain relations with the Turks; whereas, if he journeyed through Haydar Paşa without visiting the Phanar, the Greeks would be offended. The Turkish Government, however, assured him that a visit to the Phanar would be in order, and he passed through Haydar Paşa to Ankara, and upon his return visited the Patriarchate, where he was enthusiastically received by Turks and Greeks alike.⁶⁶

The execution of the Graeco-Turkish agreement concerning the population exchange on June 10, 1930, and the Graeco-Turkish Treaty of Friendship of October 31, 1930, provided a healthier atmosphere for the activities and progress of the Œcumenical Patriarchate. The long struggle, partially due to the erroneous assumption on the part of Papa Efthim, Meletios iv, and others that the Patriarchate was preeminently a culturo-political institution, ended in a reaffirmation of the status of the Œcumenical Patriarchate as laid down by the Lausanne settlement. The right of the Patriarchate to remain in Constantinople was recognized, and the Turkish demand that the Patriarch be *persona grata* to the Turkish Government and that he refrain from political activity inimical to Turkish interests was confirmed. Although the old suspicions toward the Patriarchate remained, it was allowed to function rather freely, provided that relations between Athens and Ankara were cordial. The well-being of the Œcumenical Patriarchate was, and is, largely dependent upon the temper of Graeco-Turkish diplomacy.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

SOURCE: *THE GREEK ORTHODOX THEOLOGICAL REVIEW*, VOL. VI, NO. 1, SUMMER 1959, pp. 56-80.



NOTES

1 Great Britain, Parliamentary Papers, "Lausanne Conference on Near Eastern Affairs, 1922-1923," "Records of Proceedings and Draft Terms of Peace, Turkey No. 1 (1923)," Cmd 1814. p. 333. Hereafter cited as LCNEA.

2 Ibid., pp. 336-337. While the Turkish Government was calling for the removal of the Ecumenical Patriarchate from Turkey at Lausanne, at home it sought to undermine that institution by supporting for a while the Turkish Orthodox Church plan of Papa Efthim Karahissaridis, *infra*, p. 8.

3 Ibid., pp. 316-317, 332.

4 Ibid., pp. 332-333.

5 Ibid., p. 319.

6 Ibid., pp. 324-325; Harold Nicolson, Curzon: The Last Phase, 1919- 1923 (Boston, 1934), p. 320.

7 Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Documents diplomatiques, "Conference de Lausanne," I (Paris, 1923), p. 268.

8 Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), A Speech Delivered by Ghazi Mustapha Kemal . . . October 1927 (Leipzig, 1929), pp. 572, 583-585, 588-589, 598, 681. Hereafter cited as The Speech.

Roderic H. Davison, "Turkish Diplomacy from Mudros to Lausanne," G. A. Craig and F. Gilbert, edd., The Diplomats 1919-1939 (Princeton, 1953), p. 199.

9 Alexandre Devedji, L'Échange obligatoire des minorités grecques et turques (Paris, 1929), p. 68.

Orhan Münir, Minderheiten im osmanischen Reich und in der neuen Türkei (Köln, 1937), p. 147ff.

Harry K. Psomiades, "Turkey: Progress and Problems," Middle Eastern Affairs, Vol. vii, No. 3 (March, 1957), pp. 93-95.

10 It can be argued that Ismet Pasha's declaration regarding the Patriarchate was an oral agreement and as such binding under international law. Although both Brierly and the Harvard Research group exclude oral agreements from their definitions of 'treaty,' neither denies the possibility that oral agreements may be binding under international law. Cf. the opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice in the Eastern Greenland Case, P.C.I.J., Ser. A/B, No. 52 (1933), p. 71. In this case the Court upheld that oral agreements between states have the effect of treaties. See also Herbert W. Briggs, The Law of Nations, (New York, 1952), p. 838. For oral agreements as treaties in British practice see Arnold D. McNair, The Law of Treaties: British Practice and Opinion (New York, 1938), pp. 47-50.

It is argued that the international position of the Patriarchate is supported by the Treaty of Paris, March 1856, Article rx and the Treaty of Berlin, July 1878, Article Lxn, which, it is claimed, retain their full value, even after the signature of the Treaty of Lausanne. Because the Lausanne Treaty made no mention of the Patriarchate, it is maintained that the preexisting situation is not in any way influenced by that settlement. It is also argued that Articles 40 and 41 of the Lausanne Treaty provide for the non-Muslim minorities the right to establish their own religious, social, and educational institutions. The fate of the Œcumenical Patriarch, who is also

Archbishop of Constantinople, is directly connected with that of the Greek minority in Turkey. Cf. Basil S. Giannakakis, "International Status of the Ecumenical Patriarchate," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* (Brookline, Massachusetts) Vol. n, No. 2 (December, 1956), pp. 10-26 and Vol. in, No. 1 (Summer, 1957), pp. 26-46.

11 *The Speech*, pp. 9-10, 5-9.

Atatürk Söylev ve Demeçleri, m (1918-1937) (Ankara, 1954), p. 57.

12 *Times* (London), February 7, 1923; June 29, 1923; and September 25, 1923; LCNEA, p. 324.

13 Teoman Ergene, *İstiklal Harbinde Türk Ortadoksları* [The Turkish Orthodox in the War of Independence] (Istanbul, 1951), pp. 25-26. This book was in all probability written by Papa Efthim. It presents a detailed account and defense of his program and action as leader of the Turkish Orthodox Church movement. Cf. Clair Price, *The Rebirth of Turkey* (New York, 1925), pp. 147-153.

Earlier, on November 30, 1921, Papa Efthim proclaimed the foundation of the Turkish Orthodox Church, and on December 29, 1921, the Ankara Government discussed the issue, but took no official action. See Gotthard Jäschke and Erich Pritch, "Die Türkei Seit dem Weltkriege Geschichtskalender, 1918-1928" *Die Welt des Islams*, Vol. x, 1927-1929, pp. 56-57.

14 *Times* (London), February 7, 1923, p. 9.

15 Ergene, op. cit., pp. 25-27, 69-70 .

16 LCNEA, p. 208.

17 LCNEA, p. 208.

18 LCNEA, p. 224.

19 A. A. Pallis, *Ξενητεμένοι "Έλληνες* [Greeks Abroad], (Athens, 1953), p. 184. Mr. Pallis was the Director of the Greek Red Cross at Constantinople and often acted as liaison between the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Turkish and foreign Governments during this period.

20 Ibid., pp. 185-186; *Times* (London), June 2 and 4, 1923; September 25, 1923.

21 *Times* (London), June 9, 1923. *Ileri* (Istanbul), June 2 and 9, 1923, quoted in Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, *Bulletin Périodique de la Presse Turque* (Paris), No. 29, September 13, 1923, p. 9. Hereafter cited as B.P.P.T

22 *Oriente Moderne* (Rome), November 15, 1922, pp. 382-383. Hereafter cited as O.M.

23 Pallis, op. cit., pp. 186-187.

Unpublished interview with A. A. Pallis, April 7, 1958, Athens.

During this transition period, the Turkish Government might have approved the removal of the Patriarchate to one of the Turkish islands in the Sea of Marmora. Such a transfer would have had the advantage of retaining the Patriarchate within the historical limits of Constantinople and at the same time of making it less vulnerable to Turkish pressure.

24 Ibid., p. 187.

Vatan (Istanbul), June 26, 1923 (B.P.P.T., No. 29, September 13, 1923, p. 9).

Times (London), June 27, 1923.

25 Πατρις (Athens), January 20, 1923 (O.M., February 15, 1923, p. 527).

26 Times (London), July 12, 1923, p. 14.

27 B.P.P.T., No. 31, November 19, 1923, p. 10.

28 Times (London), October 3 and 6, 1923.

29 Times (London), October 6, 1923.

Tanin (Istanbul), October 5, 1923 (B.P.P.T., No. 31, November 19, 1923, p. 11) and October 6, 1923 (O.M., October 15, 1923, p. 372).

Luke, op. cit., p. 213.

30 Times (London), October 13, 1923.

31 Times (London), November 21, 1923.

O.M., November 15, 1923, p. 349.

Technically the document of abdication rendered the illegal acts of Papa Efthim invalid.

32 Times (London), November 21, 1923, and December 7, 1923.

33 O.M., January 15, 1924, p. 30.

34 Ibid., p. 31.

Papa Efthim was subsequently defrocked (February 19, 1924) by the Holy Synod for his irregular behavior, *litri*, February 20, 1924 (B.P.P.T., No. 34, May 3, 1924, p. 13).

35 O.M., March 15, 1924, p. 177 and April 15, 1924, p. 210.

Vatan, March 10 and 13, 1924; Aksam, March 12 and 13, 1924; and Vakit, March 11, 1924 quoted in B.P.P.T., No. 34, May 3, 1924, p. 13.

36 Times (London), May 6, 1924.

37 B.P.P.T., No. 38, February 21, 1925, p. 6-7.

Echos d'Orient (Paris), Vol. xxni (1924), pp. 23-101.

Times (London), December 8 and 16, 1923.

38 B.P.P.T., No. 38, February 21, 1925, p. 7.

Times (London), December 18, 1924.

39 Times (London), December 31, 1924.

O.M., February 15, 1925, p. 97.

40 League of Nations, Official Journal, April 1925, p. 483. Hereafter cited as L.N.O.J.

41 Times (London), January 30, 1925.

Ελεύθερον Βήμα (Athens), February 3, 1925. Hereafter cited as E.V.

Department of State, Monthly Political Report, Serial 23, No. 7, February 1925, pp. 12-14.

42 Le Messenger d'Athènes, January 31, 1925.

Large demonstrations were held all over Greece in protest over the expulsion of the Patriarch. The refugee groups were especially active in these demonstrations.

43 Proceedings of the Greek Parliament, January 30, 1925, pp. 86-87. Times (London), January 31, 1925.

44 E.V., February 3, 1925.

45 B.P.P.T., No. 39, April 21, 1925, p. 3.

46 E.V., February 5, 1925.

47 Ibid.

48 B.P.P.T., No. 39, April 21, 1925, p. 3.

48a E.V., January 31 and February 3, 1925.

Times (London), February 2, 1925.

Εκκλησία (official organ of the Church of Greece), No. 8, February 21, 1925, p. 61.

49 B.P.P.T., No. 39, April 21, 1925, pp. 3-4.

E.V., February 1, 2 and 3, 1925.

Times (London), February 2, 1925.

50 Tanin, February 5, 1925 (O.M., February 15, 1925, p. 97).

51 Times (London), February 2, 1925, p. 11.

52 M.A., February 1, 1925.

Times (London), February 3, 1925.

Εκκλησία (Athens), No. 10, March 7, 1925, pp. 73-74; and Noll, March 14, 1925, p. 85.

53 L.N.O.J., (April 1925), p. 578.

54 Ibid., pp. 580-581.

55 Ibid., p. 482.

56 Ibid., p. 488.

At the discussions before the Court as to the meaning of the word *établis*, the Greek Government sought a decision of the Court exempting from exchange high ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Orthodox Church. In the Court opinion given on February 21, 1925, the Court declined to consider the question, as its opinion on ecclesiastical matters had not been asked for by the League. See "Documents Relating to Advisory Opinion No. 10, Series C. (Lausanne Convention vi, January 30, 1923, Article 2)" PCIJ, No. 7-1, Sixth Extraordinary Session. Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff's Publishing Co., 1925, 261 pp. and Publications of the Permanent Court of International Justice, Series B, No. 10, February 21, 1925, Collection of Advisory Opinions, "Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations (Lausanne Convention) vi, January 30, 1923, Article 2)" (Leyden, 1925), 28 pp.

57 Times (London), February 25, 1925.

58 Times (London), March 2, 1925.

59 E.V., April 9 and 15, 1925.

60 E.V., May 3, 1925; D. Gatopoulus, Andreas Michalakopoulos, 1875-1938 (Athens, 1947), p. 228.

The diocese areas annexed to Greece after 1912 still come under the jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and their Metropolitans are members of the Holy Synod at Constantinople. However, according to Turkish law only Turkish subjects can vote for a new Patriarch. In order to comply with the canon law and the Turkish law, an arrangement has been worked out whereby the Metropolitans of Turkey vote on certain issues, and the non-Turkish Metropolitans of the Holy Synod almost automatically approve their decisions.

61 Times (London), May 21, 1925.

62 E.V., May 30, 1925.

Unpublished interview with Constantine Rendis, Athens, April 9, 1958. Mr. Rendis was the Greek Foreign Minister in 1925 and a close friend of Tevfik Rüstü Bey, who became Turkish Foreign Minister the same year. The Greek Government, he said, recognized from the beginning that the Patriarch should be persona grata to the Turkish Government.

63 L.N.O.J. (July 1925).

64 B.P.P.T., No. 40, June 18, 1925, p. 11.

M.A., July 12 and 15, 1925.

65 Unpublished interview with Leon Maceas, Athens, April 3, 1958. Mr. Maceas was a close associate of Venizelos and was for many years associated with the Press Section of the Greek Ministry for Foreign Affairs. He was also a deputy of the Liberal Party in the Greek Parliament. He received the assurances mentioned above on behalf of the Greek Government during an interview with Kemal Pasha.

Unpublished interview with V. P. Papadakis, Athens, April 12, 1958. Mr. Papadakis was a long time member of the Greek Ministry for Foreign Affairs and served as political advisor to the Metaxas régime. In 1930, the Turkish Government asked Venizelos to restrain or expel certain Muslim religious leaders who were seeking to restore the Caliphate and to prejudice the Turkish minority in Greece against the Turkish Government. Mr. Papadakis suggested to Venizelos that in return for the Turkish request, Greece ought to insist on a Turkish guarantee which would keep Papa Efthim out of the affairs of the Phanar.

66 Times (London), October 25 and 27, 1930; November 3, 1930.

Gregorios Daphni, Ἡ Ελλάδα μεταξύ δύο πολέμων, 1923-1940 [Greece Between Two Wars, 1923-1940], n, (Athens, 1955), p. 483.